

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

A B S T R A C T

Public Servants – Panchayat Raj and Rural Development Department – Certain Irregularities in execution of work of “Road from Jarjangi-Sowdam road at Km 1/0 to Pattupuram” in PR Division Srikakulam by Sri B. Appala Naidu, Executive Engineer, PIU Division, Srikakulam - Disciplinary Proceedings, under Rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal), Rules, 1991 – Articles of Charges – Issued.

PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (VIG. II) DEPARTMENT

G.O. Rt. No. 1662

Dated: 06th, Sep, 2012

-o0o-

ORDER:-

Whereas it has been brought to the notice of the Government that Sri B. Appala Naidu, Executive Engineer, PIU Division, Srikakulam has committed certain irregularities in execution of work of “Road from Jargangi-Sowdam road at Km 1/0 to Pattupuram in Panchayat Raj Division, Srikakulam District.

2. And whereas it is proposed to hold an enquiry against Sri B. Appala Naidu, Executive Engineer, PIU Division, Srikakulam, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 20 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991.

3. The substance of the imputations of misconduct or mis-behaviour in respect of which the enquiry is proposed to be held is set out in the enclosed statement of Articles of Charges as Annexure-I. A list of documents by which; and, a list of witnesses, by whom, the Articles of Charges are proposed to be sustained, are also enclosed (Annexure-II and Annexure-III).

4. He is directed to submit his Written Statement of Defence within (15) days of the receipt of this Order. He is informed that an enquiry will be held, only in respect of those Articles of Charges, as are not admitted. He should, therefore, specifically admit or deny the Article of Charge.

5. He is further informed that if he does not submit his Written Statement of Defence within the prescribed period specified in Para.4 above, further action will be processed, based on the material available.

6. He is also informed that, as per Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, no Government Servant shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear upon any superior authority to further his interest in respect of matters pertaining to his service under the Government. If any representation is received on his behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings, it will be presumed that he is aware of such a representation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against him for violation of Rule.24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

P.T.O.

7. The receipt of this Order shall be acknowledged forthwith.
(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

C.R.BISWAL
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To
Sri B. Appala Naidu, Executive Engineer, PIU Division, Srikakulam through
Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, Hyderabad.

The Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, Hyderabad in duplicate with
a request to serve and return the dated acknowledgement copy.
SC/SFs

//Forwarded By Order//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE - 1

STATEMENT SHOWING THE DRAFT ARTICLES OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI B. APPALA NAIDU, EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PIU DIVISION, SRIKAKULAM

CHARGE:

That Sri B. Appala Naidu, Executive Engineer, PIU Division, Srikakulam District has committed certain irregularities in execution of work “Road from Jarjangi-Sowdam road at KM 1/0 to Pattupuram” in Srikakulam district., as he has 1) not obtained mix design for CC used in pavement, 2) Allowed and made payment for the substandard quality of concrete (Rejected value – Rs. 10,25,824/-) in contravening the A.P.C.S. (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

BASIS:

The V&E Officials have verified the work “Road from Jarjangi-Sowdam road at Km 1/0 to Pattupuram” in Srikakulam district., taken up under PMGSY Phase-VII grant with an estimated cost of Rs. 202.47 Lakhs and made the following observations vide Vigilance Report No. 47 (1377/V&E/E2/2009), dt. 27.07.2011.

Observations and Findings of the V&E:

- Samples of OGPC are collected from road surface and tested for bitumen content and deficiency is observed in KM 2 (3.69%) & KM 3 (4.51%).
- Core samples were extracted from hardened concrete of payment, tested for comprehensive strength and results are as below.

Sl. No.	Location of sample	Grade of concrete	Strength attained in N/Sq. mm	Required strength in N/Sq. mm	Remarks
1	KM 0/665 – R/S.	M30	17.1	22.5	failed
2	KM 0/667, centre	M30	18.1	22.5	failed
3	KM 0/667 – L/S.	M30	22.9	22.5	satisfied
	Average	M30	19.32	25.5	failed
4	KM 2/949 – R/S.	M30	14.6	22.5	failed
5	KM 2/959 centre,	M30	25.0	22.05	satisfied
6	KM 2/953 – L/S.	M30	12.6	22.5	failed
	Average	M30	16.57	25.5	failed

- The average and individual strengths in respect of two samples failed to satisfy relevant strength of M30 grade concrete in both the reaches.
- An amount of Rs. 51,241/- is proposed to be recovered from the contractor towards deficit bitumen in OGPC KM 2 (3.69%), KM 3 (4.51%).
- The work was taken up under PMGSY grant and hence, the defect liability period is 5 years. Any defects noticed within the 5 years on the road work, the contractor has to attend for rectification immediately.
- CC road payment of 200 mm thick was executed with M30 grade concrete in stretches i.e., (i) from KM 0/600 to 798.70 for a length of 197.00m and (ii) from KM 2/908.60 to 3/008.60 for a length of 100m. Since the CC cores extracted from hardened concrete of CC pavement failed to attain the required comprehensive strengths for M30 grade concrete, the CC pavement from KM 0/600 to 0/798.7 and from KM 2/908.60 TO 3/008.60 to be rejected and re-laid at the cost of Contractor. The rejected value of the work is Rs. 10,25,824/-

- The field staff have not obtained any design mix for M30 grade cement concrete.
- Tests conducted for the relative density on earthen embankment and shoulders reveal that actual relative density is less than the required, needs further consolidation.

Therefore, Sri B. Appala Naidu, Executive Engineer, PIU Division, Srikakulam district has failed to discharge his legitimate duties properly and allowed and made payment for the substandard work. Thus his action is in violation of A.P.C.S. (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

Hence, the Charge.

C.R.BISWAL
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE - II

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS BY WHICH THE ARTICLE OF CHARGES ARE
PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED.**

-000-

Vigilance & Enforcement Report No. 47 (1377/V&E/E2/2009), Dt.
27.07.2011 of the Director General, Vigilance & Enforcement, GAD.

**C.R.BISWAL
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT**

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE - III

**LIST OF WITNESSESS BY WHOM THE ARTICLE OF CHARGES ARE
PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED**

- N I L -

**C.R.BISWAL
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT**

SECTION OFFICER